

UNITED NATIONS  
  
**General Assembly**  
FORTY-FIFTH SESSION  
*Official Records*

FIFTH COMMITTEE  
52nd meeting  
held on  
Friday, 21 December 1990  
at 10 a.m.  
New York

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 52nd MEETING

Chairman: Mr. MAYCOCK (Barbados)

Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and  
Budgetary Questions: Mr. MSELLE

CONTENTS

AGENDA ITEM 125: SCALE OF ASSESSMENTS FOR THE APPORTIONMENT OF THE EXPENSES OF THE UNITED NATIONS (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 119: PROGRAMME PLANNING (continued)

AGENDA ITEM 118: PROGRAMME BUDGET FOR THE BIENNIUM 1990-1991 (continued)

Draft report of the Fifth Committee

AGENDA ITEM 134: ADMINISTRATIVE AND BUDGETARY ASPECTS OF THE FINANCING OF THE UNITED NATIONS PEACE-KEEPING OPERATIONS (continued)

COMPLETION OF THE COMMITTEE'S WORK

---

This record is subject to correction.  
Corrections should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned  
within one week of the date of publication to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, Room DC2 750,  
2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

Corrections will be issued after the end of the session, in a separate corrigendum for each Committee.

Distr. GENERAL  
A/C.5/45/SR.52  
31 December 1990

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

90-57627 3402S (E)

/...

The meeting was called to order at 11.20 a.m.

AGENDA ITEM 125: SCALE OF ASSESSMENTS FOR THE APPORTIONMENT OF THE EXPENSES OF THE UNITED NATIONS (continued) (A/C.5/45/L.22)

1. Ms. MUSTONEN (Finland), speaking as Vice-Chairman of the Committee, introduced draft resolution A/C.5/45/L.22. Section B dealt with rates of assessment for new Member States, and section C concerned the holding of information meetings by the Committee on Contributions on an experimental basis in 1991. Section A reaffirmed capacity to pay as the fundamental criterion for determining the scale of assessments, and the need for reliable, verifiable and comparable data as well as a simplified methodology. The elements referred to in paragraph 2 of the resolution should be taken into account by the Committee on Contributions in recommending a scale of assessments to the General Assembly at its forty-sixth session. Paragraph 3 recalled that ad hoc adjustment of the machine scale depended on the availability of points provided voluntarily by Member States. The report referred to in paragraph 5 was not intended to be definitive.

2. The consultations on the draft had been arduous, and that experience suggested that it was time for the Fifth Committee to devise a less laborious way of reaching agreement on resolutions acceptable to a majority of its Members. Although there was a need for consensus, there was a danger that a consensus-based approach could give members a de facto veto.

3. Draft resolution A/C.5/45/L.22 was adopted without objection.

4. Mr. DUHALT (Mexico), explaining his delegation's position on the draft resolution just adopted, said that he first of all wished to draw attention to an editorial error in paragraph 2 (b) of the Spanish text. His delegation had joined the consensus on the draft even though the text did not solve the main problems of the methodology used to calculate the scale of assessments. The General Assembly had long been aware of the need to revise its methodology in order to make it fairer, simpler and more transparent. The Committee on Contributions had proved unable to make substantive improvements.

5. Mexico had accepted adoption of the draft resolution purely as a temporary solution on the understanding that the methodology would be applied for one year only and that the General Assembly would take further action on the basis of the report to be submitted to it at its forty-sixth session by the Committee on Contributions. The elements contained in paragraph 2 of the draft resolution should be fully applied in the scale of assessments for 1992. He hoped that at the forty-sixth session the General Assembly would be able to devise a transparent and fair system for calculating the scale of assessments.

6. Mrs. GOICOCHEA (Cuba) said that she endorsed the remarks of Mexico, and those of Finland concerning decision-making in the Committee.

7. Mr. HAMEDA (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) said that his delegation had joined the consensus despite having reservations on various paragraphs. Notwithstanding the initial general approval of the recommendations of the Committee on Contributions, it had proved difficult to reach agreement on the draft resolution. His delegation's understanding was that adoption of the draft constituted approval of the recommendations of the Committee on Contributions and recognition of the fact that they would serve as the basis for the next scale of assessments. He expected there to be no change in those recommendations for non-technical reasons. His delegation also had reservations concerning paragraph 4 (c), which it understood in the light of paragraph 21 of the report of the Committee on Contributions (A/45/11). It should be noted that the low per capita income allowance formula was a political device intended to alleviate the burden on those countries with the lowest per capita incomes.

8. Ms. BERENGUER (Brazil) said that her delegation had joined in the consensus on the understanding that the draft resolution provided clear guidance to the Committee on Contributions concerning the preparation of the next scale of assessments and improvements in the methodology. Since the application of debt-adjusted income as presented by the Committee on Contributions had not proved acceptable to the General Assembly as it represented an adjustment for debt repayment rather than indebtedness, paragraph 2 (a) requested the Committee on Contributions to revert to the debt adjustment approach used in the preparation of the scale of assessments for the period 1989-1991. Her delegation understood that the use of the word "approach" instead of "formula" represented an attempt to give the Committee on Contributions more flexibility to better reflect the impact of heavy indebtedness by raising the percentage applied in the 1989-1991 scale. With regard to paragraph 2 (b), the recommendation by the Committee on Contributions to increase the upper per capita income limit of the low per capita income allowance formula to \$2,600 was significant, since it constituted a criterion for the adjustment of a major element of the methodology.

9. The task before the Committee on Contributions of reviewing the methodology was crucial. Her delegation expected that Committee to devise a methodology based on capacity to pay, which the draft resolution recognized as the fundamental criterion for determining the scale of assessments, and to include appropriate proposals in its report to the General Assembly at the forty-sixth session.

10. Mr. Y. K. GUPTA (India) said that he hoped that the Committee on Contributions would examine the concerns expressed by some delegations regarding the technical aspects of paragraph 4 (c) and prepare appropriate recommendations, and that, with respect to paragraph 3, the Committee would adopt a fair approach. It would be recalled that the Chairman of the Committee on Contributions had been unable to explain the mitigation process applied in calculating the scale of assessments for the period 1989-1991. His delegation was also concerned to ensure that there would be an adequate explanation of the application of the criteria set forth in paragraph 42 of the report of the Committee on Contributions. Member States should be given an opportunity to state their views on the adjustment process. His delegation also trusted that the Committee on Contributions would apply the criteria contained in paragraph 1 of draft resolution A/C.5/45/L.22 on a fair and

/...

(Mr. Y. K. Gupta, India)

transparent basis; failure to do so would increase Member States' desire to monitor the work of the Committee on Contributions more closely, perhaps by seeking membership on it.

11. Mr. KARBUCZKY (Hungary) said that his delegation supported Finland's remarks on decision-making in the Fifth Committee. The draft resolution just adopted represented the most substantive text on the scale of assessments in years, although he regretted the bitter bargaining which had preceded its formulation.

12. Mr. DINU (Romania) said that his delegation had confidence in the Committee on Contributions, and, accordingly, had endorsed its recommendations. He endorsed the remarks made by the representative of Finland, and trusted that the Fifth Committee would continue to adopt resolutions on the scale of assessments by consensus.

13. Mr. MONAYAIR (Kuwait) said that his delegation's understanding of paragraph 2 of the draft resolution was in accordance with the comments of the Committee on Contributions in its report.

14. Mr. LOPEZ (Venezuela) said that his delegation understood that the Committee on Contributions would formulate a scale of assessments on the basis of the criteria used for the current scale, with minor modifications. Specifically, paragraph 2 provided that the debt adjustment approach used in the preparation of the scale of assessments for the period 1989-1991 should be maintained, and that an updated low per capita income allowance formula should be applied. His delegation would have found that unacceptable, had the resolution not also requested the Committee on Contributions to continue its work on the improvement of the methodology, taking into account the elements listed in paragraph 4.

15. At the following session the Fifth Committee would thus be called upon to take a decision regarding the base period and the criteria for the formulation of a new scale of assessments. There was something of a communication gap between the Fifth Committee and the Committee on Contributions, and it was to be hoped that the latter would in future take due account of the Fifth Committee's views. The problem seemed to stem in large part from the composition of the Committee on Contributions. His delegation had proposed changes in that Committee's membership to make it more balanced and allow the views of developing countries to be more prominently expressed.

16. With regard to decision-making in the Fifth Committee, it should be clear to all when consultations were counter-productive and voting was necessary. Nevertheless, given the specific characteristics of the Fifth Committee, his delegation understood the advantages of negotiating agreed solutions. Collective responsibility and discipline were called for in the Committee, but that did not mean that delegations had any kind of veto. If, as indicated, the Chairman intended to hold consultations on the Committee's methods of work, his delegation would wish to participate.

/...

17. Mr. TEIRLINCK (Belgium) said that his delegation hoped that at the Assembly's following session a lasting solution to the problem of debt adjustment could be found. The old adjustment system, which would be maintained under the draft resolution just adopted, was far from satisfactory. The scale of assessments must be determined on the basis of verifiable data, which was not the case at present.

18. Mr. AL-KINDI (United Arab Emirates) said that his delegation had joined in the consensus on draft resolution A/C.5/45/L.22, even though it had reservations about some paragraphs, particularly paragraphs 2 and 4. In the informal consultations on the draft, the United Arab Emirates had expressed support for the recommendations set out in the report of the Committee on Contributions. However, at its following session the Committee on Contributions should take account of the concerns expressed by certain delegations at the current session of the General Assembly.

19. Mr. MAJOLI (Italy), speaking on behalf of the 12 States members of the European Community, said that he wished to confirm the position stated in the informal consultations by the Twelve, in support of the current system of reaching a consensus. However, in the particular case in question an endeavour must be made not to encroach on the competence of the Committee on Contributions. For the sake of stability in connection with the establishment of scales of assessments, and in order to obtain more information, the Twelve would prefer the period of applicability of scales of assessments to be three years, if possible.

20. Mr. RAHMA (Oman) said that, although his delegation had joined in the consensus on the draft resolution just adopted, it still had reservations about the draft. Oman interpreted paragraph 2 of the draft in the light of the recommendations made by the Committee on Contributions in its report.

21. Mr. KINCHEN (United Kingdom) said that his delegation was fully associated with the statement just made by the representative of Italy, on behalf of the 12 States members of the European Community, confirming those States' continuing support for the Committee on Contributions and for the recommendations set out in its report. The United Kingdom also supported the statement by Romania, which accurately reflected the spirit prevailing in the Fifth Committee.

22. Mr. SUGANO (Japan) said that, although his delegation welcomed the adoption of draft resolution A/C.5/45/L.22 by consensus, it would like to reflect on the matter in question before the draft was adopted in the plenary meeting. It was Japan's consistent position that recommendations made by the Committee on Contributions should be fully respected. However, in the draft just adopted by the Fifth Committee the General Assembly would request the Committee on Contributions to prepare a scale of assessments on the basis of its prior recommendations, with some modifications. Japan was unable to accept modifications in the methodology for determining the next scale of assessments. It had joined the consensus on the draft in a spirit of compromise. It noted, in that connection, that under paragraph 2 of the draft the period of applicability of the scale of assessments in question would be decided by the General Assembly. However, that was clearly a matter that must be dealt with in accordance with rule 160 of the Assembly's rules of procedure. Furthermore, Japan interpreted paragraph 3 as meaning that the

/...

(Mr. Sugano, Japan)

Committee on Contributions was being requested to use the criteria specified in paragraph 42 of its report (A/45/11) for the ad hoc adjustment of the machine scale for the period 1992-1994. Moreover, in connection with paragraph 5 of the draft, in which the Committee on Contributions was requested to submit to the General Assembly at its forty-sixth session a report on the work undertaken in response to the requests contained in paragraph 4, Japan wished to stress that the Committee on Contributions was not being requested to submit a comprehensive report on the methodology for determining the future scale of assessments; it was being requested to submit a report on any work it had undertaken.

23. Mr. MENON (Singapore) said that, although his delegation had joined in the consensus on draft resolution A/C.5/45/L.22, it was not entirely satisfied with the text. Singapore fully endorsed the statement made by the representative of Finland when introducing the draft resolution. Her statement should be transmitted to the Committee on Contributions, which should take account of her remarks.

24. Mr. AL-ERYANY (Yemen) said that he, too, endorsed the statement made by the representative of Finland.

AGENDA ITEM 119: PROGRAMME PLANNING (continued) (A/C.5/45/L.21)

25. Mr. TOMMO MONTHE (Cameroon), introducing draft resolution A/C.5/45/L.21, briefly outlined the draft before the Committee.

26. Draft resolution A/C.5/45/L.21 was adopted without objection.

27. Mr. TENNE (Israel), explaining his delegation's position on the draft just adopted, said that Israel wished to put on record its strong objection to programme 5 and programme 15, section B. Had there been a vote on those two items, his delegation would have voted against them. The sole purpose of those programmes was to call into question Israel's capacity and legal responsibility for maintaining control of the territories of Judea, Samaria and Gaza. The programmes would promote further violence in an area which required less, not more, incitement. Israel repudiated those harmful programmes and would continue to administer the territories on behalf and for the benefit of the local population until an agreed peaceful and non-violent political settlement was reached.

28. Mr. MICHALSKI (United States of America) said that, while his delegation had not objected to the adoption of draft resolution A/C.5/45/L.21 as a whole, it wished to draw attention to its previously expressed reservations on United Nations activities relating to the question of Palestine and the Law of the Sea.

AGENDA ITEM 118: PROGRAMME BUDGET FOR THE BIENNIUM 1990-1991 (continued)

Draft report of the Fifth Committee (A/C.5/45/L.15)

29. Mr. NASSER (Egypt), Rapporteur, introducing the draft report, said that part I dealt with organizational matters connected with the Committee's consideration of the agenda item. Part II indicated the revised estimates of expenditure and income approved by the Fifth Committee and the financial implications of the resolutions recommended by other Main Committees and subsequently approved by the General Assembly.

30. Part III of the report dealt with the special subjects considered by the Committee and indicated the action taken. Part IV contained the Committee's recommendations set forth in five draft resolutions. In that connection, he pointed out that the following footnote should be added to paragraph 5 of section XIII in draft resolution I A:

"Under paragraph 5 of the above decision, the Fifth Committee recommends that the General Assembly should request the Secretary-General to provide business class tickets to permanent representatives of Member States accredited to the United Nations whenever they are invited to travel on official United Nations work."

31. Mr. DANKWA (Ghana), supported by Mr. ETUKET (Uganda), said that the following paragraph should have been included in section V of draft resolution I A: "Concurs in the recommendations of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions in paragraph 14 of its report". It had presumably been omitted owing to an oversight.

32. Mr. KINCHEN (United Kingdom), supported by Mr. MICHALSKI (United States of America), expressed concern at the way in which the Committee was asked to consider the revised estimates.

33. Mr. MAJOLI (Italy) said that he supported the views just expressed by the United Kingdom and the United States. The Committee was again in the position of having to consider the programme budget at the very end of the General Assembly. To remedy that situation, he proposed that consideration should be given at the forty-sixth session of the General Assembly to the possibility of changing the dates of the budget year so that it would occur earlier, for example, from 1 October to 30 September, or later, for instance, from 1 July to 30 June.

34. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to take action on draft resolutions I to V.

Draft resolution I

35. Draft resolution I was adopted without a vote.

Draft resolutions II to IV

36. Draft resolutions II to IV were adopted without a vote.

/...

Draft resolution V

37. The CHAIRMAN said that in paragraph 2 of section C the amount "\$US 140,181,360" should be replaced by "\$US 164,966,760". In paragraph 2 (b), the words "less" and "decrease" should be replaced by the words "plus" and "increase".

38. Draft resolution V was adopted without a vote.

39. Mr. INOMATA (Japan) said that, having joined the consensus on draft resolution V, his delegation wished to reiterate its views on the need for timely documentation and substantive discussion by Member States of the content of documents. Japan was concerned that, on an inadequate basis, the Fifth Committee had approved an increase of 9.6 per cent in net requirements in an off-budget year. The United Nations should improve its methodology for the preparation of the programme budget. In particular, it should increase transparency in the methodology used in order to reflect inflation and currency fluctuations, which would facilitate broad agreement among Member States on the programme budget.

40. Mr. KALBITZER (Germany) said that his delegation was concerned at the haste with which the Committee had adopted draft resolution V, since it had had no time to study the draft report.

41. The draft report of the Fifth Committee (A/C.5/45/L.15) as a whole was adopted without a vote.

AGENDA ITEM 134: ADMINISTRATIVE AND BUDGETARY ASPECTS OF THE FINANCING OF THE UNITED NATIONS PEACE-KEEPING OPERATIONS (continued) (A/C.5/45/L.25)

42. The CHAIRMAN drew attention to the draft resolution on the item contained in document A/C.5/45/L.25.

43. Mr. VISLYKH (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), speaking on a point of order, said that, in accordance with the procedure followed by the Committee, draft resolution A/C.5/45/L.25 should not have been issued as a draft resolution submitted by the Chairman because a consensus had not been reached on the text. The sponsors of the draft should have been asked to submit it as their draft.

44. Mr. DANKWA (Ghana) said that, as the co-ordinator of the informal consultations on agenda item 134, he had thought that a consensus would ultimately be reached on draft resolution A/C.5/45/L.25. On his initiative, therefore, the document had been issued as a draft resolution submitted by the Chairman. Unfortunately, it had not been possible to reach a consensus on the text because the United States and the Soviet Union had been unable to accept paragraph 6. Otherwise, there was general agreement on the draft resolution and many delegations wished to have the text adopted.

/...

45. Mr. SEZAKI (Japan) said that his delegation did not wish to see a resumption of the old practice under which members of the Committee submitted their own draft resolutions to be adopted by a vote. The Committee had agreed to adopt draft resolutions on the basis of consensus. Accordingly, he appealed to all delegations to follow that procedure and try to reach a consensus on the draft resolution under consideration.

46. Mr. KINCHEN (United Kingdom) said that his delegation shared the view expressed by the representative of Japan. The United Kingdom was concerned about the wider implications of the Committee's manner of proceeding.

47. Mr. CONMY (Ireland), introducing draft resolution A/C.5/45/L.25 on behalf of Argentina, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Costa Rica, Cuba, Denmark, Egypt, Fiji, Finland, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Italy, Lebanon, Nepal, the Netherlands, Nigeria, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, Venezuela and Ireland, said that he hoped that the Committee would be able to adopt the draft without proceeding to a vote.

48. Mr. FOX (United States of America) said that, while there was much in draft resolution A/C.5/45/L.25 which was positive, and while a consensus resolution would be very beneficial to the Organization, his delegation could not support paragraph 6. In order to achieve consensus on paragraphs 1 to 5, the sponsors should consider deleting paragraph 6 and making it a separate draft resolution.

The meeting was suspended at 1.20 p.m. and resumed at 3.40 p.m.

49. Mr. VISLYKH (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the Committee was prevented from adopting draft resolution A/C.5/45/L.25 by consensus because of serious difficulties with the current wording of paragraph 6 of the draft. He fully endorsed the view that it would be most undesirable to violate the principle of consensus. He therefore proposed that the Committee should adopt the draft by consensus, but defer the adoption of the text of paragraph 6 to the following session. The issue in question could then be taken up at any time before the forty-sixth session, possibly at the resumed forty-fifth session scheduled in April 1991. He was confident that high-level political consultations would result in a satisfactory version of paragraph 6 by the forty-sixth session. The adoption of his proposal would be in the interest of all States and of the United Nations, since it would allow the Fifth Committee to continue to work on the basis of consensus in budgetary matters.

50. Ms. MUSTONEN (Finland), supported by Mr. CONMY (Ireland), said that it was time to take a decision on the issue, and that the Soviet proposal was unacceptable. There had already been lengthy consultations and ample documentation on the increase stipulated in paragraph 6. The Committee should therefore take immediate action on the draft resolution.

51. Mr. FOX (United States of America) said that he supported the Soviet proposal because he would regret having to vote on the important issue of peace-keeping operations. The Soviet proposal would allow the Committee to address the concerns

/...

(Mr. Fox, United States)

of troop-contributing countries while a comprehensive review of the financial arrangements for peace-keeping operations was being conducted.

52. The CHAIRMAN said that he would take Finland's statement as a request for a vote, seconded by Ireland, on the Soviet proposal.

53. A recorded vote was taken on the Soviet proposal concerning draft resolution A/C.5/45/L.25.

In favour: Barbados, Israel, Jordan, New Zealand, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United States of America.

Against: Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bangladesh, Belgium, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Italy, Japan, Lesotho, Malaysia, Mexico, Nepal, Netherlands, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Singapore, Spain, Sweden, Thailand, Uganda, United Republic of Tanzania, Venezuela, Yugoslavia.

Abstaining: Algeria, Bahrain, Benin, China, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Egypt, France, Kenya, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Turkey, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Zaire.

54. The Soviet proposal was rejected by 54 votes to 7, with 16 abstentions.

55. Mr. FOX (United States of America) proposed that paragraph 6 of draft resolution A/C.5/45/L.25 should be amended to read:

"Decides that reimbursements to Governments of troop-contributing States need periodic adjustment and that this is an issue which must be given special high-level attention at the resumed forty-fifth session of the General Assembly in April in the context of an overall consideration of peace-keeping financing arrangements, taking into account the changing character of peace-keeping activities."

56. The key elements of the amendment were the decision that periodic adjustments were required and the commitment to take action in April 1991. If the amendment was adopted, the issue under consideration would be decided upon before the forty-sixth session and even before the effective date of the new rate of reimbursement, which was 1 July 1991. He urged the Committee to adopt the amendment by consensus, since it would serve the interests of those who advocated the adoption of the current wording of paragraph 6.

/...

57. Ms. ROTHEISER (Austria) and Mr. LOPEZ (Venezuela) said that they opposed the United States amendment to paragraph 6.

58. Mr. CONMY (Ireland) and Mr. ALSTERMARK (Sweden) said that the effect of the United States amendment would be to defer a decision on the issue under consideration. They therefore opposed the amendment.

59. Mr. KINCHEN (United Kingdom), speaking in explanation of position before the vote, said that his delegation did not oppose taking a decision on the current wording of paragraph 6 of the draft resolution; nor did it oppose the United States amendment, except in so far as that amendment would involve the deletion of current paragraph 6. The United Kingdom would therefore abstain in the vote on the United States amendment, on the understanding that when a decision was taken on the content of paragraph 6, the United Kingdom would vote to increase the contribution rates for which it was liable, with the knowledge that troop-contributing States might not be reimbursed at the increased rates.

60. Ms. BERENGUER (Brazil) said that one reason why her delegation would be unable to support the United States amendment was that the issues at stake were much broader than those immediately apparent in paragraph 6. Delicate matters such as the changing character of peace-keeping operations required further clarification.

61. A recorded vote was taken on the United States amendment to document A/C.5/45/L.25.

In favour: Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United States of America.

Against: Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Mexico, Nepal, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Norway, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Singapore, Spain, Sweden, Thailand, Uganda, Venezuela, Yugoslavia.

Abstaining: Algeria, Bahrain, Benin, Cameroon, China, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Israel, Jordan, Kenya, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, New Zealand, Nigeria, Romania, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Yemen, Zaire.

62. The United States amendment was rejected by 52 votes to 3, with 21 abstentions.

63. At the request of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, a recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/C.5/45/L.25.

In favour: Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belgium, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cameroon, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lesotho, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Morocco, Myanmar, Nepal, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Senegal, Singapore, Spain, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire.

Against: Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United States of America.

Abstaining: Barbados, Benin, China, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Israel, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, New Zealand, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic.

64. Draft resolution A/C.5/45/L.25 was adopted by 82 votes to 2, with 9 abstentions.

65. Mr. MERIFIELD (Canada), speaking in explanation of vote after the vote, said that the unfortunate course of action just taken by the Committee had probably resulted from some confusion as to the nature of the decision, which should not be interpreted as a failure to achieve consensus on the actual question of increasing the rate of reimbursement to troop-contributing States. Those delegations which had opposed the decision did so for political reasons which, strictly speaking, fell outside the purview of the Fifth Committee. His delegation believed that the Committee had taken the right decision but hoped that the vote would not constitute a precedent in connection with other issues to be considered in the future.

66. Mr. MORDACQ (France) regretted that the Committee had failed to take a decision by consensus on a matter of great financial significance. His country, as a troop-contributing State and a permanent member of the Security Council, had voted in favour of what it felt was a balanced text. It hoped that the Fifth Committee's practice of taking decisions by consensus would remain in place.

67. Mr. KINCHEN (United Kingdom) said that his delegation, which also represented a troop-contributing State and a permanent member of the Security Council, could sympathize with the points of view of all protagonists in the issue under consideration. It deeply regretted that such action had been taken at a time when alternative proposals were still being explored. All members of the Committee should reflect on the consequences if a precedent were to be set. It should be remembered that the issue at stake had nothing whatsoever to do with the matters covered in General Assembly resolution 41/213.

/...

68. Mr. CONMY (Ireland) endorsed the remarks made by the representatives of Canada, France and the United Kingdom. The result of the vote served as an acknowledgement of the burden borne by troop-contributing States. It was regrettable that some delegations should have opposed an increase in reimbursement rates which was long overdue. His delegation, nevertheless, hoped that the vote would not constitute a precedent.

69. Mr. HAMEDA (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) said that it was regrettable that the decision had been left until such a late stage in the Committee's proceedings. His delegation had abstained in the vote because it had been unable to contact its authorities for corresponding instructions.

70. Mr. DANKWA (Ghana) said that, while consensus decisions were desirable, voting was nevertheless not prohibited either by the rules of procedure or by the provisions of General Assembly resolution 41/213. The issue was not so much that of setting a precedent but whether all could accept the expressed will of the majority. He hoped that members would note the virtues of negotiation.

71. Mr. FONTAINE ORTIZ (Cuba) said that he endorsed the remarks made by the representative of Ghana. The provisions of the Charter remained valid in connection with the adoption of decisions.

72. Mr. SEZAKI (Japan) said that his delegation, as a major contributor, was very sensitive to any rise in the cost of peace-keeping operations. However, it had voted in favour of what it considered to be a reasonable increase in the rates of reimbursement. It deeply regretted the Committee's failure to adopt a consensus decision.

73. Mr. MAJOLI (Italy) said that the positive votes by all members of the European Community had confirmed not only the unity of the Community but the importance which its individual members attached to peace, which had its price. It was his view that the vote on the specific issue under discussion would not disrupt the Committee's practice of adopting consensus decisions on all financial questions.

74. Mr. CORNELISSEN (Netherlands) said that his delegation regretted the lack of consensus but believed that the Committee's decision had been correct. Proper reimbursement was an essential element of the orderly management of United Nations peace-keeping operations, both from the point of view of troop-contributing States and as an expression of the international community's collective responsibility for peace.

#### COMPLETION OF THE COMMITTEE'S WORK

75. The CHAIRMAN said that he was convinced that the Fifth Committee could conduct its work in a more efficient manner with better results. Accordingly, he had suggested that delegations should meet informally to discuss methods of work with a view to realizing benefits at future sessions. At the current session the Fifth Committee had demonstrated its resolve to defend its area of competence, and had taken a number of decisions to control undesirable encroachment by any Main

(The Chairman)

Committee on the designated area of competence of another. With regard to the staff of the United Nations, the Committee must find some effective means of communication, to the benefit of both sides. Committee members should note that, had it proved possible to start meetings at or near to the scheduled time, and had delegations spoken less, the Committee could have finished its work several days earlier without recourse to weekend and night meetings.

76. After an exchange of courtesies, the CHAIRMAN declared that the Committee had completed its work for the forty-fifth session.

The meeting rose at 5.30 p.m.